arXiv:1211.3972v1 [math.AP] 16 Nov 2012

ILL-POSEDNESS OF THE INCOMPRESSIBLE MAGNETO-HYDRODYNAMICS SYSTEM IN $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$

MIMI DAI

Abstract. We demonstrate that the three dimensional incompressible magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD) system is ill-posed in the largest scaling invariant space $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$. The construction method of initial data used in this paper is different from the one in [7]. Specifically, we construct initial data which has finite energy and is small enough in $H^s \cap \dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$, with $s < \frac{1}{2}$, such that any Leray-Hopf type of weak solution to the MHD system starting from this initial data is discontinuous at time $t = 0$ in the metric of $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$. In particular, we start with the same data for the velocity and magnetic field $u_0 = b_0$ and obtain the ill-posedness for the coupled system. While in [7], the case $u_0 = b_0$ was not observed to develop "norm inflation" which is a severe type of ill-posedness. Thus the work in this paper can be considered as a complementary study of the work [7] and a further investigation regarding the ill-posedness property for the MHD system.

The motivation of the method in this paper comes from Cheskidov and Shyvdkoy's work [6] for the Euler equation and the Navier-Stokes equation.

KEY WORDS: magneto-hydrodynamic system; ill-posedness; $\dot{B}^{-1,\infty}_{\infty}$;

CLASSIFICATION CODE: 76D03,35Q35.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the three dimensional incompressible magneto-hydro-dynamics (MHD) system:

$$\begin{aligned} u_t - \mu\triangle u + u\cdot\nabla u - b\cdot\nabla b + \nabla p = 0,\\ b_t - \nu\triangle b + u\cdot\nabla b - b\cdot\nabla u = 0,\\ \nabla\cdot u = 0, \quad \nabla\cdot b = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

with the initial conditions

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x,0) = b_0(x),\\ \nabla\cdot u_0 = 0, \quad \nabla\cdot b_0 = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, $t \geq 0$, u is the fluid velocity, p is the pressure of fluid, and b is the magnetic field. The parameter μ denotes the kinematic viscosity coefficient of the fluid and ν denotes the reciprocal of the magnetic Reynolds number. Since the two coefficients do not play an important rule in this paper, we let $\mu = \nu = 1$. When the magnetic field $b(x,t)$ vanishes, the incompressible MHD system reduces to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. The solutions to the MHD system share the same scaling property of the solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation, that is,

$$u_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t),\ b_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda b(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t),\ p_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda^2 p(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$$

solve the MHD system (1.1) with the initial data

$$u_{0\lambda} = \lambda u_0(\lambda x), \ b_{0\lambda} = \lambda b_0(\lambda x),$$

if $u(x,t)$ and $b(x,t)$ solve the MHD system (1.1) with the initial data $u_0(x)$ and $b_0(x)$. The space that is invariant under the above scaling is called critical space. Examples of critical spaces for the MHD system in three dimension are

$$\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hookrightarrow L^3 \hookrightarrow \dot{B}^{-1+\frac{3}{p}}_{p|p<\infty,\infty} \hookrightarrow BMO^{-1} \hookrightarrow \dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}.$$

(see [4], for example, for the discussions of the embeddings).

The study of Navier-Stokes equations as well as of MHD system in critical spaces has been one of the focus of the research activities since the initial work of Kato [10]. In this paper we study the ill-posedness behavior of solutions to the MHD system (1.1) in the largest critical space $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$.

We recall the standard definition of well/ill-posedness here. A Cauchy problem is said to be locally well-posed in a Banach space X if : (i) for every initial data $v_0(x) \in X$ there exists a time $T = T(v_0) > 0$ such that a solution to the initial value problem exists in the time interval $[0,T]$; (ii) the solution is unique in a certain Banach space $Y \subset C([0,T];X)$; (iii) and the solution map

$$\mathcal{M} : X \longrightarrow C([0,T];X), \quad v_0 \longmapsto \mathcal{M}(v_0)$$

is continuous. If the time T can be arbitrarily large the Cauchy problem is said to be globally well-posed. The Cauchy problem is said to be ill-posed if it is not well-posed. Based on this definition, it can be seen that a Cauchy problem may be ill-posed due to different reasons, ranging from the failure of a solution to be continuous in the metric of the Banach space X to the failure of a solution map to be continuous.

For the Navier-Stokes equation (NSE), Koch and Tataru [11] (2001) were able to establish global well-posedness with small initial data in the critical space BMO^{-1}. The well-posedness of the NSE in the largest critical space $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$ had been a long time standing open problem. Later, Bourgain and Pavlović [3] (2008) showed the ill-posedness for the NSE in $\dot{B}^{-1,\infty}_{\infty}$ by describing a "norm inflation" happens. More precisely, the authors constructed some arbitrarily small initial data in $\dot{B}^{-1,\infty}_{\infty}$ which produced an arbitrarily large solution in $\dot{B}^{-1,\infty}_{\infty}$ almost instantaneously. The "norm inflation" phenomena implies the solution map $\mathcal{M} : \dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty} \to C([0,T];\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty})$ is discontinuous at the origin of $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$.

For the MHD system, Miao, Yuan and Zhang [13] proved the existence of a global mild solution in BMO^{-1} for small initial data and uniqueness of such solution in $C([0,\infty);BMO^{-1})$. Hence, the well-poseness was established in the critical space BMO^{-1}. Later, Dai, Qing and Schonbek [7] established the "norm inflation" type ill-posedness for the three dimensional MHD system in the largest critical space $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$ by applying the ingenious construction method in Bourgain and Pavlović's work [3]. We adopted the idea of [3] and constructed the initial data by using a large sequence of periodic functions $\cos(k\cdot x)$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since the MHD system is a coupled system of the NSE and the Maxwell equation, the authors were able to construct different initial data to produce different types of "norm inflation" in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$. Particularly the magnetic field can develop norm inflation in short time even when the velocity remains small and vice verse. As an pretty interesting case when $u_0 = b_0$ and no matter how large the size of the data is in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$, the "norm inflation" was not observed due to the cancelation of interactions between the velocity u and the magnetic field b in the work [7]. However, it was not clear whether or not any ill-posedness behavior other than "norm inflation" would happen in the special case $u_0 = b_0$.

In this paper we demonstrate a different construction method from the one used in [7] to show the ill-posedness of the MHD system in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$. The idea of the initial data construction is motivated from the original work of Cheskidov and Shyvdkoy [6] for the Euler equation and the Navier-Stokes equation. More precisely, we construct the data $(u_0, b_0) \in \dot{B}^{-1+3/r}_{r,\infty} \times \dot{B}^{-1+3/r}_{r,\infty}$ for all the Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{-1+3/r}_{r,\infty}$ with $1 < r \leq \infty$, such that any Leray-Hopf type weak solution starting from (u_0, b_0) does not tend to (u_0, b_0) as $t \to 0$ in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$. This result indicates the MHD system is ill-posed in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$ due to the failure of a solution to be continuous at time $t = 0$. It is worth to mention that such data (u_0, b_0) also belongs to $L^2 \times L^2$ which tells it has finite energy. Another important observation is that, we particularly choose $u_0 = b_0$ to deduce the ill-posedness and hence the result gives a positive answer to the question in the end of the last paragraph.

As pointed out in [6], we work in the periodic space $\mathbb{T}^3$ due to two reasons: firstly, "we do not make use of infinitesimally small frequencies in our analysis"; secondly, the construction is "more transparent when the frequency space is a lattice". It was also pointed out that the results may be carried over to the case of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as well with the technique developed in [5].

We state the main result in the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let* (u, b) *be a weak solution to the MHD system (1.1) with the data* (u_0, b_0). *And* $u, b \in C_w([0,T]; L^2) \cap L^2([0,T]; H^1)$, $u_0 = b_0 \in \dot{B}^{-1+3/r}_{r,\infty}$ *with a certain form for all* $1 < r \leq \infty$. *Then there exists a constant* $\delta = \delta(u, b) > 0$ *such that*

$$\limsup_{t\to 0^+} \|u(t) - u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}} + \|u(t) - u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}} \geq \delta. \tag{1.3}$$

If in addition (u, b) *is a Leray-Hopf type of weak solution satisfying the traditional energy inequality, the constant* δ *can be chosen independent of* (u, b).

Remark 1.2. For the existence of weak solutions to the MHD system, we refer the readers to the work of Sermange and Temam [15]. A typical approach is to construct a sequence of Galerkin approximating solutions which satisfy a uniform energy estimate, then use some compactness arguments to pass through the limit.

The rest of the paper is organized as: in Section 2 we introduce some notations that shall be used throughout the paper and some auxiliary results; in Section 3 we devote to proving Theorem 1.1.

2. Preliminaries and auxiliary results

2.1. **Notation.** We denote by $A \lesssim B$ an estimate of the form $A \leq CB$ with some constant C, and by $A \sim B$ an estimate of the form $C_1 B \leq A \leq C_2 B$ with some constants C_1, C_2.
We denote the trilinear term

$$u \otimes v : \nabla w = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_i \partial_i w_j u_j dx. \tag{2.4}$$

To simplify the notations we denote $\|\cdot\|_p = \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^n)}$.

2.2. **Littlewood-Paley decomposition.** The techniques presented in this paper rely strongly on the Littlewood-Paley decomposition. Thus we recall the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory here briefly. For a more detailed description on this theory we refer the readers to the books by Bahouri, Chemin and Danchin [1] and Grafakos [9].

We define the Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform as

$$\hat{f}(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x)dx,$$
$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(g)(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix\cdot\xi} g(\xi)d\xi.$$

Note that $f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\hat{f})$.

We denote $\lambda_q = 2^q$ for integers q. A nonnegative radial function $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is chosen such that

$$\chi(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } |\xi| \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 0, & \text{for } |\xi| \ge 1. \end{cases}$$

Then we define

$$\varphi(\xi) = \chi(\frac{\xi}{2}) - \chi(\xi)$$

and

$$\varphi_q(\xi) = \begin{cases} \varphi(\lambda_q^{-1}\xi) & \text{for } q \ge 0, \\ \chi(\xi) & \text{for } q = -1. \end{cases}$$

For a tempered distribution vector field v on the torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ we consider the Littlewood-Paley projections

$$v_q(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{v}(k)\varphi_q(k)e^{ik\cdot x}, \qquad q \ge -1. \tag{2.5}$$

One of the main results used in the Littlewood-Paley theory is that the following identity

$$v = \sum_{q=-1}^{\infty} v_q$$

holds in the distribution sense. Essentially the sequence of the smooth functions φ_q forms a dyadic partition of the unit. For the simplification of the notations, we denote

$$v_{\le q} = \sum_{j=-1}^{q} v_j, \qquad \tilde{v}_q = v_{q-1} + v_q + v_{q+1}.$$

By the definition of φ_q, it is noticed that $supp\,(v_q) \cap supp\,(v_p) = \emptyset$ if $|p-q| \ge 2$.

By the Littlewood-Paley decomposition we define the inhomogeneous Besov spaces $B^s_{r,l}$ and the homogeneous Besov spaces $\dot{B}^s_{r,l}$ on the torus $\mathbb{T}^3$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \le l, r \le \infty$. Let us write the norms

$$\|f\|_{B^s_{r,l}} = \left[\sum_{q\ge -1} (\lambda_q^s \|f_q\|_r)^l\right]^{1/l}, \quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{r,l}} = \left[\sum_{q\in\mathbb{Z}} (\lambda_q^s \|f_q\|_r)^l\right]^{1/l}.$$

Then

$$B^s_{r,l}(\mathbb{T}^n) = \left\{ f \in S' : \|f\|_{B^s_{r,l}} < \infty \right\}$$
$$\dot{B}^s_{r,l}(\mathbb{T}^n) = \left\{ f \in S' : \|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{r,l}} < \infty \right\},$$

where S' denotes the space of all tempered distributions.

Note that the two norms $\|\cdot\|_{B^s_{r,l}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{B}^s_{r,l}}$ are equivalent in the periodic case and hence $B^s_{r,l}(\mathbb{T}^n) = \dot{B}^s_{r,l}(\mathbb{T}^n)$ (c. f. [14]). Thus, we use the inhomogeneous notation $B^s_{r,l}(\mathbb{T}^n)$ for the involved Besov spaces through out the rest of the paper.

We introduce a useful inequality for the dyadic blocks of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition in the following.

Lemma 2.1. *(Bernstein's inequality)*[12] *For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \le p \le \infty$ and for all tempered distributions $f \in \mathcal{S}'$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{C}\lambda_q^{|\alpha|}\|f_q\|_p \le \|\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial x^\alpha} f_q\|_p \le C\lambda_q^{|\alpha|}\|f_q\|_p \tag{2.6}$$

for an absolute constant C.

2.3. **The existence of Leray-Hopf type of weak solution to the incompressible MHD system.** We recall the result on the existence of weak solutions (Leray-Hopf type) for the MHD system from Sermange and Temam's book [15].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $(u_0(x), b_0(x)) \in L^2 \times L^2$. Then, there exists a weak solution (u, b) to (1.1) and (1.2) satisfying the energy inequality*

$$\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2 + 2\int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_2^2 + \|\nabla b(s)\|_2^2 ds \le \|u_0\|_2^2 + \|b_0\|_2^2 \tag{2.7}$$

for all $t > 0$.

Remark 2.3. The existence of weak solutions to the MHD system was established for both the non-periodic case and the periodic case in [15].

3. Proof of the main theorem

In this section we construct initial data (u_0, b_0) with $u_0, b_0 \in H^s \cap B^{\frac{3}{r}-1}_{r,\infty}$ for all $1 < r \le \infty$ such that the solution (u, b) does not converge to (u_0, b_0) in $B^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$ as $t \to 0$. Thereby, we prove the main Theorem 1.1.

3.1. **Construction of initial data.** Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a fixed small number. We choose a sequence $q_1 < q_2 < \dots$ with elements sufficiently far apart so that

$$\frac{\lambda_{q_i}^2}{\lambda_{q_{i+1}}} < \epsilon. \tag{3.8}$$

We fix a small number $c > 0$ and consider the following blocks of integers:

$$A_j = [(1-c)\lambda_{q_j}, (1+c)\lambda_{q_j}] \times [-c\lambda_{q_j}, c\lambda_{q_j}]^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^3$$
$$B_j = [-c\lambda_{q_j-1}, c\lambda_{q_j-1}]^2 \times [(1-c)\lambda_{q_j-1}, (1+c)\lambda_{q_j-1}] \cap \mathbb{Z}^3$$
$$C_j = A_j + B_j$$
$$A_j^* = -A_j, \quad B_j^* = -B_j, \quad C_j^* = -C_j.$$

Thus, A_j, C_j and their conjugates A_j^*, C_j^* lie in the λ_{q_j}-th shell, while B_j, B_j^* lie in the λ_{q_j-1}-th shell.

Let $p(\xi)$ be the symbol of the Leray-Hopf projection

$$p(\xi) = I - \frac{\xi \otimes \xi}{|\xi|^2}.$$

We denote

$$\vec{e}_1(\xi) = p(\xi)\vec{e}_1, \quad \vec{e}_2(\xi) = p(\xi)\vec{e}_2,$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$.

The initial data u_0 is defined by

$$u_0 = \sum_{j\geq 1} U_{q_j} + U_{q_j-1} \tag{3.9}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{F}(U_{q_j})(\xi) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{q_j}^2}\left(\vec{e}_2(\xi)\chi_{A_j\cup A_j^*} + i(\vec{e}_2(\xi)-\vec{e}_1(\xi))\chi_{C_j} - i(\vec{e}_2(\xi)-\vec{e}_1(\xi))\chi_{C_j^*}\right) \\ \mathcal{F}(U_{q_j-1})(\xi) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{q_j}^2}\vec{e}_1(\xi)\chi_{B_j\cup B_j^*}. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

We note that $\tilde{U}_{q_j} = U_{q_j-1} + U_{q_j}$, since u_0 has no modes in the (q_j+1)-th shell. Let $b_0 = u_0$. We have

$$\nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0,$$

since $p(\xi)$ is a divergence free projection.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $1 < r \leq \infty$, we have $u_0, b_0 \in B_{r,\infty}^{\frac{3}{r}-1}$. In particular, $u_0, b_0 \in H^s$ for any $s < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: On the block A_j, for $1 < r < \infty$, we have, by the boundedness of the Leray-Hopf projection and the Plancherel theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\vec{e}_2(\xi)\chi_{A_j})\|_r &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi_{A_j})\|_r \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\|\chi_{A_j}\|_{r^*} \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\lambda_{q_j}^{3(1-\frac{1}{r})} \end{aligned}$$

with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r^*} = 1$. On all the other blocks A_j^*, B_j, B_j^*, C_j and C_j^*, we have similar estimates. Hence,

$$\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{3}{r}-1}\|U_{q_j}\|_r \lesssim 1, \quad \lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{3}{r}-1}\|U_{q_j-1}\|_r \lesssim 1.$$

Therefore, $u_0, b_0 \in B_{r,\infty}^{\frac{3}{r}-1}$, for $1 < r < \infty$. When $r = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{q_j}\|_\infty &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}(U_{q_j})\|_1 \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\left(\int_{\chi_{A_j\cup A_j^*}} 1 d\xi + \int_{\chi_{C_j}} 1 d\xi + \int_{\chi_{C_j^*}} 1 d\xi\right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

And similarly, we have

$$\|U_{q_j-1}\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}$$

Therefore, $u_0, b_0 \in B^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$.

In particular, for $r = 2$, the embedding $B^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,\infty} \subset H^s$ holds for all $s < \frac{1}{2}$. It completes the proof of the lemma.

$\square$

Remark 3.2. Specially taking $s = 0$ in the lemma, we have $(u_0, b_0) \in L^2 \times L^2$ which indicates the initial data has finite energy.

Lemma 3.3. *Let U_{q_j} and U_{q_j-1} be defined in (3.10). We have*

$$\|U_{q_j}\|_p \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{p}}, \quad \|U_{q_j-1}\|_p \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{p}}. \tag{3.12}$$

Hence,

$$\|\tilde{U}_{q_j}\|_p \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{p}}.$$

Proof: By the Plancherel theorem and the boundedness of the Leray-Hopf projection, we infer from (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{q_j}\|_p &\le C\|\mathcal{F}(U_{q_j})\|_{p^*} \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\left(\|\chi_{A_j}\|_{p^*} + \|\chi_{C_j}\|_{p^*}\right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{3}{p^*}} \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r^*} = 1$. Noticing that $\lambda_{q_j-1} = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{q_j}$, the other two estimates can be obtained similarly. It completes the proof of the lemma.

$\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Let u_0 be defined in (3.9). We have*

$$u_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} \sim \lambda_{q_j}. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof: Note that $supp\ \{U_i\} \cap supp\ \{U_j\} = \varnothing$ for any $|i-j| \ge 2$. We decompose the term as

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} &= \sum_{k \ge j+1} \tilde{U}_{q_k} \otimes \tilde{U}_{q_k} : \nabla U_{q_j} + \tilde{U}_{q_j} \otimes \tilde{U}_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} \\ &\quad + U_{\le q_j-1} \otimes \tilde{U}_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} + \tilde{U}_{q_j} \otimes U_{\le q_j-1} : \nabla U_{q_j} \\ &= \sum_{k \ge j+1} \tilde{U}_{q_k} \otimes \tilde{U}_{q_k} : \nabla U_{q_j} + U_{q_j-1} \otimes U_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} \\ &\quad - U_{q_j} \otimes U_{q_j} : \nabla U_{\le q_{j-1}} \\ &\equiv I + II - III \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where we used integration by parts and the divergence free property of U_{q_j}.
Applying Bernstein's inequality (2.6) and (3.11) yields

$$|I| \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}\|U_{q_j}\|_\infty \sum_{k \ge j+1} \|\tilde{U}_{q_k}\|_2^2 \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^2 \sum_{k \ge j+1} \lambda_{q_k}^{-1} \lesssim \frac{\lambda_{q_j}^2}{\lambda_{q_{j+1}}} \le \epsilon, \tag{3.15}$$

where we used Lemma 3.3 to get the second inequality and the fact $\sum_{k \ge j+1} \lambda_{q_k}^{-1} \le \frac{1}{\lambda_{q_{j+1}}}$ to get the third inequality. Similarly, we obtain

$$|III| \lesssim \|U_{q_j}\|_2^2 \sum_{k \ge j-1} \lambda_{q_k}\|\tilde{U}_{q_k}\|_\infty \lesssim \frac{\lambda_{q_{j-1}}^2}{\lambda_{q_j}} \le \epsilon. \tag{3.16}$$

Applying Bernstein's inequality (2.6), Lemma 3.3 and (3.11), the term B is estimated as

$$|II| \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2\|U_{q_j}\|_\infty \sim \lambda_{q_j}. \tag{3.17}$$

Combining (3.14), (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17), it yields the conclusion of the lemma. $\square$

3.2. **Finishing the proof of the main theorem.** We are ready to prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 : Multiplying the first equation in (1.1) by u_{q_j} and integrating over $\mathbb{T}^3$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\partial_t\tilde{u}_{q_j}\cdot u_{q_j}\,dx &= -\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\nabla\tilde{u}_{q_j}\cdot\nabla u_{q_j}\,dx + u\otimes u:\nabla u_{q_j} - b\otimes b:\nabla u_{q_j}\\ &\geq -\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}|\nabla u|^2dx + u\otimes u:\nabla u_{q_j} - b\otimes b:\nabla u_{q_j}.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above inequality on time interval $[0,t]$ implies

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{u}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2 - \int_0^t\|\nabla u\|_2^2ds + \int_0^t u\otimes u:\nabla u_{q_j} - b\otimes b:\nabla u_{q_j}\,ds. \tag{3.18}$$

Similarly, multiplying the second equation in (1.1) by b_{q_j} and integrating over space and the time interval $[0,t]$ yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{b}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2 - \int_0^t\|\nabla b\|_2^2ds + \int_0^t u\otimes b:\nabla b_{q_j} - b\otimes u:\nabla b_{q_j}\,ds. \tag{3.19}$$

Denote $E(t)=\int_0^t\|\nabla u\|_2^2+\|\nabla b\|_2^2ds$. Adding (3.18) and (3.18), we have

(3.20)

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\left(\|\tilde{u}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2+\|\tilde{b}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2\right)\geq\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2-E(t)\\ &+\int_0^t u\otimes u:\nabla u_{q_j} - b\otimes b:\nabla u_{q_j} + u\otimes b:\nabla b_{q_j} - b\otimes u:\nabla b_{q_j}\,ds\\ &\geq\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2-E(t)+c_1\lambda_{q_j}t\\ &-c_2\int_0^t|u\otimes u:\nabla u_{q_j}-u_0\otimes u_0:\nabla U_{q_j}|+|b\otimes b:\nabla u_{q_j}-b_0\otimes b_0:\nabla U_{q_j}|ds\\ &-c_2\int_0^t|u\otimes b:\nabla b_{q_j}-u_0\otimes b_0:\nabla U_{q_j}|+|b\otimes u:\nabla b_{q_j}-b_0\otimes u_0:\nabla U_{q_j}|ds\\ &\equiv\|U_{q_j}\|_2^2-E(t)+c_1\lambda_{q_j}t-c_2R(t)\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (3.13), and c_1, c_2 denote positive constants. In the following, we use a contradiction argument to show the conclusion of the theorem holds.

Assume for every $\delta>0$ there exists $t_0=t_0(\delta)>0$ such that

$$\|u(t)-u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}}+\|b(t)-b_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}}<\delta, \quad \text{for all } 0<t\leq t_0. \tag{3.21}$$

We claim that for a large enough j_0, the integral R is bounded at time t_0 as

$$R(t_0)<\frac{c_1}{2c_2}\lambda_{q_j}t_0, \quad \text{for all } j\geq j_0. \tag{3.22}$$

We first estimate the second term in the integral R. Let $w = u - u_0$ and $y = b - b_0$. Note that by the assumption (3.21), we have

$$\|w_p\|_\infty \le \delta\lambda_p, \quad \|w_p\|_\infty \le \delta\lambda_p, \quad \text{for all } p \ge -1. \tag{3.23}$$

The difference of the trilinear terms can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & b\otimes b : \nabla u_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes b_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} \\ & = y \otimes b_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} + b \otimes y : \nabla U_{q_j} + b \otimes b : \nabla w_{q_j} \\ & \equiv A + B + C. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Due to the fact that *supp* $\{y_i\} \cap$ *supp* $\{(b_0)_j\} = \varnothing$ for any $|i-j| \ge 2$ and the interaction of different frequencies (c. f. [2]), we decompose A as

$$\begin{aligned} A = & \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j, |p'-p''|\le 2} y_{p'} \otimes (b_0)_{p''} : \nabla U_{q_j} + y_{\le q_j} \otimes (\tilde{b}_0)_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} \\ & + \tilde{y}_{q_j} \otimes (b_0)_{\le q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} - r_A \\ & \equiv A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - r_A \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where r_A is the overlap part of A_2 and A_3.
Recall $u_0 = b_0$. Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein's inequality (2.6), (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1| & \le \|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_4 \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j, |p'-p''|\le 2} \|y_{p'}\|_\infty \|(u_0)_{p''}\|_{4/3} \\ & \lesssim \lambda_{q_j} \|U_{q_j}\|_4 \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j, |p'-p''|\le 2} \|y_{p'}\|_\infty \lambda_{p''}^{-5/4} \\ & \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1+\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j, |p'-p''|\le 2} \delta\lambda_{p'} \lambda_{p''}^{-5/4} \\ & \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_2| & = |U_{q_j} \otimes (\tilde{b}_0)_{q_j} : \nabla y_{\le q_j}| \le \|U_{q_j}\|_2 \|\tilde{U}_{q_j}\|_2 \|\nabla y_{\le q_j}\|_\infty \\ & \lesssim \|U_{q_j}\|_2 \|\tilde{U}_{q_j}\|_2 \sum_{p\le q_j} \lambda_p \|y_p\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{p\le q_j} \delta\lambda_p^2 \\ & \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}. \end{aligned}$$

For A_3, we take some $r, r^* > 1$ satisfying $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r^*} = 1$. Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein inequality, (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |A_3| & \le \|\tilde{y}_{q_j}\|_\infty \|U_{\le q_j}\|_{r^*} \|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_r \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^2 \|U_{\le q_j}\|_{r^*} \|U_{q_j}\|_r \\ & \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^2 \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{r}} \sum_{p\le q_j} \lambda_p^{1-\frac{3}{r^*}} = \delta\lambda_{q_j} \sum_{p\le q_j} \left(\frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_{q_j}}\right)^{\frac{3}{r}-2}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose r close enough to 1 such that $\frac{3}{r} - 2$ is close enough to 1. Hence

$$\sum_{p\le q_j} \left(\frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_{q_j}}\right)^{\frac{3}{r}-2} \le \sum_{p\le q_j} 2^{(p-q_j)(\frac{3}{r}-2)} \lesssim 1,$$

which implies $|A_3|\lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}$. Therefore,

$$|A|\lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}. \tag{3.26}$$

We decompose B in a similar way,

$$\begin{aligned} B=&\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2} b_{p'}\otimes y_{p''}:\nabla U_{q_j}+b_{\leq q_j}\otimes(\tilde y)_{q_j}:\nabla U_{q_j}\\ &+\tilde b_{q_j}\otimes y_{\leq q_j}:\nabla U_{q_j}-r_B\\ &\equiv B_1+B_2+B_3-r_B \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

where r_B is the overlap part of B_2 and B_3.
Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein inequality, (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1|\leq&\|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_2\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2}\|b_{p'}\|_2\|y_{p''}\|_\infty\\ \lesssim&\lambda_{q_j}\|U_{q_j}\|_2\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2}\|b_{p'}\|_2\delta\lambda_{p''}\\ \lesssim&\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac12}\sum_{p'\geq q_j}\|\nabla b_{p'}\|_2\lesssim\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac12}\|\nabla b\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_2|=&|U_{q_j}\otimes\tilde y_{q_j}:\nabla b_{\leq q_j}|\leq\|U_{q_j}\|_2\|\tilde y_{q_j}\|_\infty\|\nabla b_{\leq q_j}\|_2\\ \lesssim&\lambda_{q_j}\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{-1/2}\|\nabla b\|_2\lesssim\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac12}\|\nabla b\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |B_3|\leq&\|\tilde b_{q_j}\|_2\|y_{\leq q_j}\|_\infty\|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_2\lesssim\lambda_{q_j}\|\tilde b_{q_j}\|_2\|U_{q_j}\|_2\sum_{p\leq q_j}\delta\lambda_p\\ \lesssim&\delta\lambda_{q_j}^2\lambda_{q_j}^{-1/2}\|\tilde b_{q_j}\|_2\lesssim\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{1/2}\|\nabla\tilde b_{q_j}\|_2\lesssim\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac12}\|\nabla b\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$|B|\lesssim\delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac12}\|\nabla b\|_2. \tag{3.28}$$

An analogously decomposition for C yields,

$$\begin{aligned} C=&\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2} b_{p'}\otimes b_{p''}:\nabla w_{q_j}+b_{\leq q_j}\otimes\tilde b_{q_j}:\nabla w_{q_j}\\ &+\tilde b_{q_j}\otimes b_{\leq q_j}:\nabla w_{q_j}-r_C\\ &\equiv C_1+C_2+C_3-r_C \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

with r_C being the overlap of C_2 and C_3.
Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein's inequality (2.6), (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |C_1|\leq&\|\nabla w_{q_j}\|_\infty\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2}\|b_{p'}\|_2\|b_{p''}\|_2\\ \lesssim&\lambda_{q_j}\|w_{q_j}\|_\infty\sum_{p',p''\geq q_j,|p'-p''|\leq 2}\|\nabla b_{p'}\|_2\|\nabla b_{p''}\|_2\lambda_{p'}^{-1}\lambda_{p''}^{-1}\\ \lesssim&\delta\lambda_{q_j}^2\lambda_{q_j}^{-2}\|\nabla b\|_2^2\lesssim\delta\|\nabla b\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|C_2| = |U_{q_j} \otimes \tilde{y}_{q_j} : \nabla b_{\le q_j}| &\le \|U_{q_j}\|_2 \|\tilde{y}_{q_j}\|_\infty \|\nabla b_{\le q_j}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \lambda_{q_j} \delta \lambda_{q_j}^{-1/2} \|\nabla b\|_2 \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla b\|_2,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|C_3| &\le \|\tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 \|b_{\le q_j}\|_2 \|\nabla w_{q_j}\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda_{q_j} \|\tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 \|b\|_2 \|w_{q_j}\|_\infty \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 \|b\|_2 \|w_{q_j}\|_\infty \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

In the last step of the estimate of C_3, we used the fact that $\|b\|_2$ is uniformly bounded. Hence, we have

$$
|C| \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 + \delta \|\nabla b\|_2^2. \tag{3.30}
$$

Combining (3.24), (3.26), (3.28), (3.30) and the estimate $b \in L^2(H^1)$ gives that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{t_0} |b \otimes b : \nabla u_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes b_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \\
&\lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} t_0 + \delta \lambda_{q_j}^{1/2} \int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla b\|_2 ds + \delta \int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla b\|_2^2 ds + \delta \lambda_{q_j} \int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 ds \\
&\lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} t_0 + \delta \lambda_{q_j}^{1/2} t_0^{1/2} + \delta + \delta \lambda_{q_j} t_0^{1/2} \left(\int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2^2 ds \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}
$$

It follows from $b \in L^2(H^1)$ that,

$$
\int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2^d s \to 0 \quad \text{as } j \to \infty.
$$

Therefore we choose j_0 large enough and δ small enough such that

$$
\int_0^{t_0} |b \otimes b : \nabla u_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes b_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \le \frac{c_1}{8c_2} \lambda_{q_j} t_0.
$$

A similar procedure can show that the first term in R satisfies the similar estimate

$$
\int_0^{t_0} |u \otimes u : \nabla u_{q_j} - u_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \le \frac{c_1}{8c_2} \lambda_{q_j} t_0.
$$

The last two terms in R represent the interaction of velocity field and magnetic field. In the following we briefly compute the fourth term to obtain the desired estimate. The third term can be estimated similarly.
The fourth term is rewritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&b \otimes u : \nabla u_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} \\
&= y \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j} + b \otimes w : \nabla U_{q_j} + b \otimes u : \nabla y_{q_j} \\
&\equiv D + E + F.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}
$$

We decompose D as

$$
\begin{aligned}
D = &\sum_{p', p'' \ge q_j, |p' - p''| \le 2} y_{p'} \otimes (u_0)_{p''} : \nabla U_{q_j} + y_{\le q_j} \otimes \widetilde{(u_0)}_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} \\
&+ \tilde{y}_{q_j} \otimes (u_0)_{\le q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} - r_D \\
&\equiv D_1 + D_2 + D_3 - r_D
\end{aligned}
$$

with r_D being the overlap of D_2 and D_3.
Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein inequality, (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned}|D_1| &\le \|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_4 \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j,|p'-p''|\le 2} \|y_{p'}\|_\infty \|(u_0)_{p''}\|_{4/3}\\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1+\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j,|p'-p''|\le 2} \delta\lambda_{p'}\lambda_{p''}^{-5/4} \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}|D_2| &= |U_{q_j}\otimes(\tilde{U})_{q_j} : \nabla y_{\le q_j}| \le \|U_{q_j}\|_2\|\tilde{U}_{q_j}\|_2\|\nabla y_{\le q_j}\|_\infty\\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{p\le q_j} \delta\lambda_p^2 \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}|D_3| &\le \|\tilde{y}_{q_j}\|_\infty \|U_{\le q_j}\|_{r^*}\|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_r \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^2 \|U_{\le q_j}\|_{r^*}\|U_{q_j}\|_r\\ &\lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^2 \lambda_{q_j}^{1-\frac{3}{r}} \sum_{p\le q_j} \lambda_p^{1-\frac{3}{r^*}} = \delta\lambda_{q_j} \sum_{p\le q_j} \left(\frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_{q_j}}\right)^{\frac{3}{r}-2} \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}.\end{aligned}$$

In the estimate of D_3, we choose a certain r close enough to 1 and $\frac{1}{r}+\frac{1}{r^*}=1$. Hence,

$$|D| \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}. \tag{3.33}$$

We decompose E as,

$$\begin{aligned}E =& \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j,|p'-p''|\le 2} b_{p'}\otimes w_{p''} : \nabla U_{q_j} + b_{\le q_j}\otimes \tilde{w}_{q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j}\\ &+ \tilde{b}_{q_j}\otimes w_{\le q_j} : \nabla U_{q_j} - r_E\\ &\equiv E_1+E_2+E_3-r_E\end{aligned}$$

with r_E being the overlap of E_2 and E_3.
Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein's inequality, (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned}|E_1| &\le \|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_2 \sum_{p',p''\ge q_j,|p'-p''|\le 2} \|b_{p'}\|_2\|w_{p''}\|_\infty\\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q_j}^{1/2} \sum_{p'\ge q_j} \delta\|\nabla b_{p'}\|_2 \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla b\|_2,\end{aligned}$$

$$|E_2| = |U_{q_j}\otimes\tilde{w}_{q_j} : \nabla b_{\le q_j}| \le \|U_{q_j}\|_2\|\tilde{w}_{q_j}\|_\infty\|\nabla b_{\le q_j}\|_2 \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla b\|_2,$$

$$|E_3| \le \|\tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2\|w_{\le q_j}\|_\infty\|\nabla U_{q_j}\|_2 \lesssim \|\nabla\tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2\|U_{q_j}\|_2 \sum_{p\le q_j}\delta\lambda_p \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla b\|_2.$$

Hence, we have

$$|E| \lesssim \delta\lambda_{q_j}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla b\|_2. \tag{3.34}$$

An analogously decomposition for F yields,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F = & \sum_{p',p''\geq q_j, |p'-p''|\leq 2} b_{p'} \otimes u_{p''} : \nabla y_{q_j} + b_{\leq q_j} \otimes \tilde{u}_{q_j} : \nabla y_{q_j} \\
& + \tilde{b}_{q_j} \otimes u_{\leq q_j} : \nabla y_{q_j} - r_F \\
& \equiv F_1 + F_2 + F_3 - r_F
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.35}
$$

with r_F being the overlap of F_2 and F_3.
Applying Hölder inequality, Bernstein's inequality (2.6), (3.23) and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
|F_1| &\leq \|\nabla y_{q_j}\|_\infty \sum_{p',p''\geq q_j, |p'-p''|\leq 2} \|b_{p'}\|_2 \|u_{p''}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j}^2 \sum_{p',p''\geq q_j, |p'-p''|\leq 2} \|\nabla b_{p'}\|_2 \|\nabla u_{p''}\|_2 \lambda_{p'}^{-1} \lambda_{p''}^{-1} \\
&\lesssim \delta \|\nabla b\|_2 \|\nabla u\|_2 \lesssim \delta(\|\nabla b\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u\|_2^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|F_2| = |y_{q_j} \otimes \tilde{u}_{q_j} : \nabla b_{\leq q_j}| &\leq \|y_{q_j}\|_\infty \|\tilde{u}_{q_j}\|_2 \|\nabla b_{\leq q_j}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \delta \|\nabla \tilde{u}_{q_j}\|_2 \|\nabla b_{\leq q_j}\|_2 \lesssim \delta(\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla b\|_2^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
|F_3| \leq \|\tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 \|u_{\leq q_j}\|_2 \|\nabla y_{q_j}\|_\infty \lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2 \|u\|_2 \|y_{q_j}\|_\infty \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2.
$$

Thus, we have

$$
|F| \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2. \tag{3.36}
$$

Combining (3.32), (3.33), (3.34), (3.36) and the estimate $u, b \in L^2(H^1)$ gives that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{t_0} |b \otimes u : \nabla b_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \\
& \lesssim \delta \lambda_{q_j} t_0 + \delta \lambda_{q_j}^{1/2} t_0^{1/2} + \delta + \delta \lambda_{q_j} t_0^{1/2} \left(\int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla \tilde{b}_{q_j}\|_2^2 ds \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore we choose j_0 large enough and δ small enough such that, for all $j \geq j_0$

$$
\int_0^{t_0} |b \otimes u : \nabla b_{q_j} - b_0 \otimes u_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \leq \frac{c_1}{8c_2} \lambda_{q_j} t_0.
$$

The third term in the integral R can be estimated analogously and satisfies

$$
\int_0^{t_0} |u \otimes b : \nabla b_{q_j} - u_0 \otimes b_0 : \nabla U_{q_j}| ds \leq \frac{c_1}{8c_2} \lambda_{q_j} t_0,
$$

for all $j \geq j_0$. Therefore, we have shown that the claim (3.22) holds under the assumption (3.21). It follows from (3.20) and (3.22) that

$$
\frac{1}{2} \left(\|\tilde{u}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\tilde{b}_{q_j}(t)\|_2^2 \right) \geq \|U_{q_j}\|_2^2 - E(t) + \frac{c_1}{2} \lambda_{q_j} t_0
$$

which implies $\|u(t_0)\|_2 + \|b(t_0)\|_2$ is infinity. It is a contradiction. Thus it completes the proof of the theorem.

$\square$

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank Natasa Pavlović for bringing this project into my attention and for her useful suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations.* Grundlehrender Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[2] J. Bony. *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularité pour leséquations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires.* Ann. Ecole Norm. Sup., 14: 209–246, 1981.

[3] J. Bourgain and N. Pavlović. *Ill-posedness of the Navier-Stokes equations in a critical space in 3D.* Journal of Functional Analysis, 255:2233–2247, 2008.

[4] M. Cannone. *Harmonic analysis tools for solving the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations.* In Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics, Vol. III:161–244, 2004.

[5] A. Cheskidov, P. Constantin, S. Friedlander and R. Shvydkoy. *Energy conservation and Onsagers conjecture for the Euler equations.* Nonlinearity, 21(6): 1233–1252, 2008.

[6] A. Cheskidov and R. Shvydkoy. *Ill-posedness of basic equations of fluid dynamics in Besov spaces.* Mathematics Subject Classification, 2000.

[7] M. Dai, J. Qing, and M. E. Schonbek. *Norm Inflation for Incompressible Magneto-Hydrodynamics System in* $\dot{B}_{\infty}^{-1,\infty}$. Advances in Differential Equations, Vol. 16, No. 7–8, 725–746, 2011.

[8] P. Germain. *The second iterate for the Navier-Stokes equation.* Journal of Functional Analysis, 255, no. 9, 2248–2264, 2008.

[9] L. Grafakos. *Modern Fourier analysis.* Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 250. Springer, New York, 2009.

[10] T. Kato. *Strong* L^p*-solutions of Navier-Stokes equations in* R^m *with applications toweak solutions.* Math. Z. 187: 471–480, 1984.

[11] H. Koch and D. Tataru. *Well posedness for the Navier-Stokes equations.* Adv. Math., 157:22–35, 2001.

[12] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset. *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem.* Chapman and Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, 431. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.

[13] C. Miao, B. Yuan, and B. Zhang. *Well-posedness for the incompressible magneto-hydrodynamic system.* Math. Meth. Appl. Sci., 30:961–976, 2007.

[14] H. -J. Schmeisser and H. Triebel. *Topics in Fourier analysis and function spaces.* Geest, Leipzig, Germany; John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 1987.

[15] M. Sermange and R. Temam. *Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 36:635–664, 1983.

[16] T. Yoneda. *Ill-posedness of the 3D-Navier-Stokes equations in a generalized Besov space near* BMO^{-1}. Journal of Functional Analysis, 258, no. 10, 3376–3387, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER, BOULDER, CO, 80303,USA

E-mail address: `mimi.dai@colorado.edu`